

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

CONTINUATION OF EMERGENCY
POSED BY PROLIFERATION OF
WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION
AND THEIR DELIVERY SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-138)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. Consistent with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems declared by Executive Order 12938 on November 14, 1994, as amended, is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 2003. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was signed on November 6, 2002, and published in the *Federal Register* on November 12, 2002 (67 Fed. Reg. 68493).

Because the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the means of delivering them continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States, I have determined the national emergency previously declared must continue in effect beyond November 14, 2003.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 29, 2003.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL
EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO
SUDAN—MESSAGE FROM THE
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-139)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a na-

tional emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. Consistent with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating the Sudan emergency is to continue in effect beyond November 3, 2003, to the *Federal Register* for publication. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the *Federal Register* on October 31, 2002 (67 Fed. Reg. 66525).

The crisis between the United States and Sudan constituted by the actions and policies of the Government of Sudan that led to the declaration of a national emergency on November 3, 1997, has not been resolved. These actions and policies are hostile to U.S. interests and pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to Sudan and maintain in force the comprehensive sanctions against Sudan to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 29, 2003.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURGESS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

LETTERS FROM CONSTITUENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, 1838, former President, then-Congressman, John Quincy Adams came to the House floor because he was prohibited, as were the other Members of Congress, from debating the most important issue of the day.

Conservative leadership in the House of Representatives between 1838 and 1842 had passed a rule prohibiting and banning the discussion of slavery on the floor of the House of Representatives. Then-Congressman John Quincy Adams came to the floor, day after day, week after week, sharing letters from his constituents, many of them

from women who could not vote in those days, sharing letters from his constituents asking, pleading with the House, that they debate the issue of slavery and that they ban and wipe away that blot on American history.

In some ways similarly today, Members of this House have not had the opportunity to debate the issues of Iraq, of keeping our troops safe in Iraq, of providing and supplying our troops, of the corruption and the incompetence in the Pentagon and in the Bush administration in supplying the troops and turning over so many public dollars to private contractors.

As a result, I would like to share some of those concerns. Since we are not debating the issues on the House floor, I would like share some of the concerns with letters from my constituents.

Sabba, from Richfield, Ohio, writes, "The Bush administration had no concrete evidence confirming the weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Bush completely disregarded the United Nations' dissenting opinion."

You can see in letter after letter I am receiving in Ohio, and my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. JONES) and Members from both parties in Ohio are receiving from all over the country, people's concerns that the President and the administration may not have leveled with the American people about all of these issues.

□ 2100

Margaret of Strongsville writes, "Please don't throw money into a vast pit which will affect us all for another several generations."

Margaret is referring to the \$1 billion a week that the President is already spending in Iraq, a third of that money unaccounted for, going to private contractors, many of them the President's friends, and that is where she and so many others believe there is so much waste and so much pork.

Marvin of Akron, Ohio, says, "The request must be carefully scrutinized and unnecessary expenditures removed."

Thomas of Akron, Ohio, writes, "How much debt is acceptable?"

What he is writing about is he understands, as most Members of this House do, I think, on both sides of the aisle, that the \$87 billion is put on a government credit card. We are going to spend our children's and our grandchildren's money, in large part, because Congress has voted a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans. The average millionaire in this country, as Thomas knows from his letter, the average millionaire in this country gets a \$93,000 tax cut. Half of Ohioans get no tax cut at all. Yet, we are not going to rescind that tax cut for the richest of Americans, for the American millionaires

that get \$93,000; we are going to put this war on a credit card so that that \$87 billion plus the \$80 billion that Congress has already spent, plus the tens of billions more that we know President Bush will ask for, will be paid for by our children and our grandchildren.

Crystal of Akron writes, "Please think long and hard before you spend \$87 billion. To what end?" We hear that over and over and over.

When I read these letters, Mr. Speaker, one thing also that comes out is people understand that of this \$1 billion a week we are spending in Iraq, one-third of it goes to private contractors. Most of those private contracts are unbid contracts, and most of that money is going to friends of the President. Halliburton, Bechtel, corporation after corporation, if you look at FEC reports, you see those corporations, the employees of those corporations are giving hundreds of thousands and, in some cases, millions of dollars to the President's campaign. And to make that even worse, Mr. Speaker, Halliburton, the company where the former CEO is now the Vice President of the United States, DICK CHENEY, Halliburton has received over \$2 billion in government contracts, over \$1 billion in unbid, unaccounted for contracts; and Halliburton is still paying Vice President CHENEY, still paying Vice President CHENEY \$13,400 a month. Vice President CHENEY is receiving \$13,000, more than \$13,000 a month, \$160,000 a year, from this company that gets unbid contracts of taxpayer dollars to fix Iraq, to supply the troops, to do whatever that Halliburton is supposedly doing.

Halliburton's profits have gone sky high while they have the go on these contracts, while they have paid the Vice President of the United States. It is just amazing to me. All of us in this body should be incredulous that we are spending this kind of money, giving this money to a company like Halliburton, with unbid contracts, literally hundreds of millions of dollars a week, and then this company turns around and pays Vice President CHENEY \$13,000 a month.

Mr. Speaker, I close with the last letter, Anthony from Akron, Ohio: "Bush needs to face up to these facts. I am 16 years old. I myself feel that growing up in America will now be tougher because of all of these things that are going on."

Mr. Speaker, end the corruption, end the incompetence of the Bush administration in Iraq, do it right. Fix Iraq the right way. Stop the corruption. Stop the incompetence.

WASHINGTON WASTE WATCHERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise again this week as cofounder of the

Washington Waste Watchers, a Republican effort designed to bring the disinfectant of sunshine into the shadowy corners of the wasteful Washington bureaucracy.

Last week, the Treasury Department reported the current fiscal year deficit, excluding Social Security receipts, closed at \$535 billion, one of the largest deficits ever. Faced with this growing budget deficit and obvious unparalleled homeland security needs, surely we must do something.

Now, Democrats say the only way to cut the deficit is to yet again raise taxes on the American family. I disagree. We do have a historically large deficit, but not because the American people are taxed too little. It is because Washington spends too much.

Since 1998, just 5 years ago, Federal spending has increased 22 percent and the amount the Federal Government spends per household has increased from \$16,000 to \$21,000 per household. This is a 5-year spending binge, the likes of which we have not seen since World War II. But the binge did not start just yesterday. The Federal budget has been growing seven times faster than the family budget for the last 2 generations. This assault on the family budget is unfair, unsustainable, and unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, much of the spending in Washington is also pure waste, fraud, and abuse. And by attacking it every day, we can begin to reduce this deficit. That is why the Washington Waste Watchers are here.

Mr. Speaker, tonight, let us just look at a few questionable examples of spending in one Federal agency, the National Institutes of Health, or NIH. NIH is funding a 6-year grant to study American Indian and native Alaskan lesbian-gay, bisexual, transgender, and "two-spirited" individuals. This study is estimated to cost the American taxpayer over \$3 million. Part of the purpose of this study is to "facilitate future goals of designing and evaluating interventions to address the urgent needs of two spirits."

We are fighting a war on terrorism and this is urgent? And, even worse, Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this?

NIH is also paying approximately \$276,000 for a 4-year study on the sexual behavior of 80- and 90-year-old men. What are we supposed to do with this information? NIH has also handed out over \$107,000 to fund a research on mediums or, in their words, "individuals who regularly enter altered states of consciousness as part of a religious ritual." Combined, that is \$383,000 of the American people's hard-earned tax dollars. And Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this?

NIH is also funding studies on reactions to pornography, sexual risk-taking, and they also chipped in for a conference on sexual arousal, all of which will end up costing the American taxpayer an estimated \$650,000 over 2 years. Mr. Speaker, \$650,000, and Demo-

crats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this?

They are spending an estimated \$1.2 million over 6 years on Chinese panda research, and we have no native pandas in America. They are also spending \$4.6 million on sexologists.

Mr. Speaker, the few items I just mentioned are from just one government agency, and it will waste over \$10 million of the American taxpayers' money.

Now, tonight I wish I could say these were unique examples but, unfortunately, this type of waste has been going on in this city for years and years. Now, Mr. Speaker, I certainly support scientific research, and NIH has done some very great work, especially in the area of cancer research. But where are our priorities? Where is our common sense? Where is the accountability? Does anybody really believe at a time of historically large deficits, with enormous homeland security needs, that we need to be spending over \$10 million of hard-earned American family money on sexologists and Chinese panda research? If these are the grants that are approved by NIH, I would hate to see the ones they turn down.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many different ways that we can save money in Washington without cutting any needed services and without raising taxes on hard-working Americans. Because when it comes to funding programs in Washington, it is not how much money Washington spends; it is how Washington spends the money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ROSS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)